

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	
Telecommunications Relay Service)	CC Docket No. 98-67
And Speech-to-Speech Services)	
For Individuals with)	DA 02-1826
Hearing and Speech Disabilities)	

To: The Federal Communications Commission

**COMMENTS OF THE TEXAS COMMISSION ON STATE
EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS**

The Texas Commission on State Emergency Communications (“TX-CSEC”) respectfully files these comments to the July 29, 2002, public notice requesting comments on the proposed clarification to change “nearest” PSAP to the most “appropriate” PSAP for purposes of the Minimum Standards for Telecommunications Relay Services in 47 C.F.R. § 64.604(a)(4).

TX-CSEC is a state agency charged with the implementation and administration of 9-1-1 emergency communications in certain areas of Texas and is the state’s authority on emergency communications.¹ TX-CSEC would note that from a 9-1-1 operational perspective the “nearest” PSAP and the most “appropriate” PSAP might be different PSAPs. Therefore, when Telecommunications Relay Services are being used in emergency situations, for purposes of reaching a PSAP, the proposed clarification of “appropriate” PSAP would make it more equivalent to the situation where a caller had dialed 9-1-1 directly.²

¹ Texas Health and Safety Code Ann. Section 771.051(a) (Vernon Supp. 2002).

² It is preferred that the 9-1-1 emergency number be dialed directly in emergency situations.

A review of the relevant FCC orders leads TX-CSEC to believe that the “appropriate” PSAP (and not the “nearest” PSAP) was the FCC’s original intent. See, *TRS Order on Reconsideration*³ at ¶ 6 (“With respect to the treatment of emergency calls, the Commission required in the *TRS Order* that relay providers shall immediately connect an emergency call to the **appropriate** Public Safety Answering Point, or PSAP. ... In this Order, we amend the rule to require relay providers to forward the call to the *appropriate* PSAP” [emphasis in bold added]); see also, *TRS Order*⁴ at 100. Therefore, TX-CSEC believes that the proposed change to “appropriate” is truly a clarification that makes the language of the rule consistent with the FCC’s original intent in adopting the rule.

TX-CSEC appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments.

Respectfully submitted,

Rupaco T. González, Jr.
State Bar No. 08131690

Richard A. Muscat
State Bar No. 14741550

Attorneys to the TX-CSEC

The González Law Firm, P.C.

³ Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities, *Order on Reconsideration*, CC Docket No. 98-67, FCC No. 00-200 (re. June 5, 2000) (“*TRS Order on Reconsideration*”).

⁴ Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities, *Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, CC Docket No. 98-67, FCC No. 00-56 (re. March 6, 2000) (“*TRS Order*”).

PMB # 117
8127 Mesa Drive, Suite B 206
Austin, TX 78759
(512) 330-9696
(512) 330-9898 (FAX)
pacolaw@msn.com

Certificate of Service

I certify that a copy of these comments is being served on or before August 29, 2002 by regular or overnight mail, or fax on the Commission Secretary and other the personnel required by the public notice or electronically as provided by the public notice.

Richard Muscat